



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/01/97, 867

02/23/98

CARROLL

F

2734-CIP-Z

EXAMINER

QM11/0114

JIM ZEGLEN

SUITE 100

901 NORTH PITT STREET

ALEXANDRIA VA 22314

PATTERSON, M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3728

DATE MAILED:

01/14/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/027,867

Applicant(s)

Carroll

Examiner

Marie Patterson

Group Art Unit

3728



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Dec 16, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 3208

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the Amendment filed 12/16/98, the office action mailed on 12/23/98 has been withdrawn and a new office action follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 9 the phrase "said threaded stud" lacks antecedent basis rendering the claim vague and indefinite.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1 and 11-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-16 of U. S. Patent No. 5,794,367 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly

Art Unit: 3208

extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: both claim a cleat with a plurality of peripheral teeth which are angled outwardly

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

5. Claims 2-10 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16 of U.S. Patent No.5,794,367 in view of Kelly or Jordan '114.

Patent '367 claims a cleat substantially as claimed except for an anti-debris ring. Kelly or Jordan '114 teaches providing an anti-debris ring (24 or 7). It would have been obvious to provide an anti-debris ring as taught by either Kelly or Jordan in the cleat of Patent '367 to prevent debris from getting between the cleat body and the shoe sole.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 3208

7. Claims 1, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bouyer (EPO 524861).

Bouyer shows a cleat comprising a body member (1) with a threaded stud (figures 1 and 3) and a plurality of teeth (3) which have an "outward angulation" (shown in figure 2 by surfaces 6, 6A, and 6B) as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 13, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouyer.

Bouyer shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact material for the cleat. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polyurethane with a hardness of 45D-95D, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In reference to claim 19, it is well known and conventional to provide "fillets" on threaded members to lock the threaded members in place. It would have been obvious to provide a fillet as is well known and conventional to prevent the clear from loosening.

Art Unit: 3208

10. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouyer in view of either Johnson or Kataoka '913.

Bouyer shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact shape of the peripheral teeth. Johnson or Kataoka teaches shaping projection teeth with one cone shaped surface (40 or 44) and the other side being pyramid shaped (44 or 43, figure 14a). It would have been obvious to form the teeth with one cone shaped surface and one pyramid surface as taught by either Johnson or Kataoka in the cleat of Bouyer to prevent damage to the turf and to make the teeth safer to participants.

11. Claims 2- 5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bouyer in view of either Kelly or Jordan '114.

Bouyer shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for an anti-debris ring. Kelly or Jordan '114 teaches providing an anti-debris ring (24 or 7). It would have been obvious to provide an anti-debris ring as taught by either Kelly or Jordan in the cleat of Bouyer to prevent debris from getting between the cleat body and the shoe sole.

Bouyer shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact material for the cleat. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polyurethane with a hardness of 45D-95D, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Art Unit: 3208

In reference to claim 4, Bouyer as modified above discloses the claimed invention except for the exact angle of the teeth. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an angle of $37\frac{1}{2}$ degrees, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*,

In reference to claim 9, it is well known and conventional to provide "fillets" on threaded members to lock the threaded members in place. It would have been obvious to provide a fillet as is well known and conventional to prevent the clear from loosening.

12. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 2-5 and 7-9 above, and further in view of either Johnson or Kataoka '913.

Bouyer as modified above shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact shape of the peripheral teeth. Johnson or Kataoka teaches shaping projection teeth with one cone shaped surface (40 or 44) and the other side being pyramid shaped (44 or 43, figure 14a). It would have been obvious to form the teeth with one cone shaped surface and one pyramid surface as taught by either Johnson or Kataoka in the cleat of Bouyer to prevent damage to the turf and to make the teeth safer to participants.

13. Claims 1, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Softspikes (A Unique Holiday Offer article) in view of Dassler (4,375,728).

Art Unit: 3208

Softspikes shows a cleat with a threaded stud and a plurality of peripheral teeth substantially as claimed, except for the peripheral teeth being angled outwardly. Dassler clearly teaches outwardly angling teeth (2-4) of a cleat (1). It would have been obvious to outwardly angle the teeth as taught by Dassler in the cleat of Softspikes to increase cushioning, and to provide traction and skid resistance in all directions.

In reference to claims 13, 17, and 18, Softspikes as modified above shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact material for the cleat. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use polyurethane with a hardness of 45D-95D, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In reference to claim 12, it is well known and conventional to provide "fillets" on threaded members to lock the threaded members in place. It would have been obvious to provide a fillet as is well known and conventional to prevent the cleat from loosening.

14. Claims 2-5 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19 above, and further in view of Kelly or Jordan.

Softspikes as modified above shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for an anti-debris ring. Kelly or Jordan '114 teaches providing an anti-debris ring (24 or 7). It would have been

Art Unit: 3208

obvious to provide an anti-debris ring as taught by either Kelly or Jordan in the cleat of Softspikes as modified above to prevent debris from getting between the cleat body and the shoe sole.

In reference to claim 4, Softspikes as modified above discloses the claimed invention except for the exact angle of the teeth. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an angle of 37 ½ degrees, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*,

15. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 2-5 and 7-9 above, and further in view of either Johnson or Kataoka '913.

Softspikes as modified above shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact shape of the peripheral teeth. Johnson or Kataoka teaches shaping projection teeth with one cone shaped surface (40 or 44) and the other side being pyramid shaped (44 or 43, figure 14a). It would have been obvious to form the teeth with one cone shaped surface and one pyramid surface as taught by either Johnson or Kataoka in the cleat of Softspikes as modified above to prevent damage to the turf and to make the teeth safer to participants.

16. Claims 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1, 11, 13, 15, and 17-19 above, and further in view of either Johnson or Kataoka '913.

Art Unit: 3208


Softspikes as modified above shows a cleat substantially as claimed except for the exact shape of the peripheral teeth. Johnson or Kataoka teaches shaping projection teeth with one cone shaped surface (40 or 44) and the other side being pyramid shaped (44 or 43, figure 14a). It would have been obvious to form the teeth with one cone shaped surface and one pyramid surface as taught by either Johnson or Kataoka in the cleat of Softspikes as modified above to prevent damage to the turf and to make the teeth safer to participants.

17. Telephone inquiries regarding the status of applications or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Ebony Smith at (703)305-3570.

For applicant's convenience, the Group Technological Center FAX number is (703) 305-3579. Please identify Examiner ____ of Art Unit ____ at the top of your cover sheet of any correspondence submitted.

Inquiries concerning the merits of the examination should be directed to Marie Patterson whose telephone number is (703) 308-0069.


Marie Patterson
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

MDP
January 11, 1999